Mr. Soumyendranath Tagore has written a devastating critique of him in French. Mr. Hutchinson, in his survey of the national struggle in *Empire of the* $_{v}$|*abobs*$_{y}$ adopts a similar position. It is interesting that Mr. Subash Bose, now President of the Congress and presumably a loyal henchman of the Mahatma, was very critical of his tactics in his book. *The Indian Struggle,* written in 1934.

The Socialist critics accuse Gandhi of almost cynically exploiting the superstitions of the people, and of being an agent of the Indian *bourgeoisie.* They point out the manner in which he has repeatedly called off his campaigns in the name of non-violence when they appeared to be becoming mass revolutionary struggles. They refer to his justification of caste and cow protection and his belief in co-operation between workers and employers. They accuse him, moreover, of having more than once betrayed the peasantry.

Edward Thompson, from another angle, regards Gandhi as a saint who marred his sanctity by getting involved in politics, of which he made a muddle. But Thompson is always cantankerous about the Congress.

It is quite clear from such contradictory statements that Gandhi is a very much more complex character than either his critics or his admirers allow. His thought is often paradoxical and confused.[1]

Without adding to the heat of the controversy, there are some points that I may make from personal observation and wide discussion with many workers within the Congress. Not even Soumyen Tagore denies the immense personal charm of Gandhi. There is something candid and childlike about him which is deeply moving. \Vhen with him it is difficult to resist him. He puts his cards on the table and is honest; he welcomes frank criticism and has more than once said that if other counsels than his should [1] Cf. Nehru's analysis: *Autobiography*', pp. 515-52. 101